

The future of *Focus/Focus on CDS* – 2008 survey results

Contents

Executive Summary	2-4
1. Introduction	2
2. Results analysis	2
2.1 Content	2
2.2 Two magazines?	2
2.3 Frequency	2
2.4 Using the magazine	2
2.5 Moving online	3
3. Other comments	3
Full report	4-12
1. Introduction	4
1.1 Publicity	4
1.2 Response rate and method	4
1.3 Comparison with 2006 survey	4
2. Results – analysis	5-12
2.1 Content	5
2.1.1 Useful content	5
2.1.2 Why people read <i>Focus/Focus on CDS</i>	5
2.1.3 Improving the magazine	6
2.1.4 In summary	6
2.2 Two magazines?	7
2.2.1 Who reads what	7
2.2.2 Who wants what	7
2.2.3 In summary	8
2.3 Frequency	8
2.3.1 In summary	9
2.4 Using the magazine	9
2.4.1 How much people read	9
2.4.2 Passing the magazine on	9
2.4.3 Referring to back issues	9
2.4.4 In summary	9
2.5 Moving online	9
2.5.1 Paper or screen?	10
2.5.2 Computer confidence	10
2.5.3 Testing the examples	11
2.5.4 In summary	11
2.6 Other comments	12
Appendices	13
Appendix 1	13
Appendix 2	16
Appendix 3	18
Appendix 4	19
Appendix 5	20
Appendix 6	21
Appendix 7	22
Appendix 8	21
Appendix 9	22

The future of *Focus/Focus on CDS*

Executive summary

1. Introduction

The [Focus/Focus on CDS readers' survey](#) ran from 27/03/08 until 30/04/08. It was available to complete online and a paper copy was sent to approximately 23,000 people on the *Focus* mailing list.

A total of 389 people responded to the survey:

- responded **online** – 72 (18.5%)
- responded **by post** – 317 (81.5%)

2. Results analysis

2.1 Content

- *Focus* and *Focus on CDS* are primarily seen as **news and reference publications**
- **Comment pieces and case studies** are considered **less useful** – although comment pieces from legal aid providers or related bodies would be welcomed
- Many respondents would like to see some **changes to the structure** of the magazine, making it **more targeted** (eg dividing content up into areas of work or adding regional sections)
- Many respondents would also welcome some **additions to the content** (eg adding a forthcoming events guide)
- 115 people would like the magazine to be **more frequent**.

2.2 Two magazines?

- The number of people who only receive *Focus on CDS* is very small (around 10% of the distribution list)
- Most people would prefer the two publications to **remain separate**.

2.3 Frequency

- A more frequent publication (monthly/every other month) is more popular than remaining quarterly:
 - **30%** for maintaining a quarterly schedule
 - **66%** for moving to a more frequent schedule (monthly or every other month)
 - In addition, 113 people (29%) indicated in Q4 that making *Focus/Focus on CDS* more frequent would improve the publications – the 5th most popular option.
- A very small number of people indicated other options for frequency, but not enough to influence the decision.

2.4 Using the magazine

- Most people (68%) only read the bits of the magazine **relevant to their work**.
- The magazine is clearly **viewed as useful**, whether read in full or in part:
 - 75% of respondents sometimes or always pass the magazine on to others to read
 - 72% of respondents refer to back issues.

2.5 Moving online

- a large number of respondents (242) will probably **still print out** some or part of the magazine
- a large number of respondents (251) will read it on screen either before they print, or instead of printing
- a smaller number of respondents (75) will only use the magazine as a print out
- 63 respondents are not sure yet how they will use the online magazine.

3. Other comments

43 people responded to the questions asking for other comments about *Focus/Focus on CDS*.

Several people made the same sort of comments, which were:

- don't make it online
- *Focus* is a waste of money
- send email alerts when a new one is published
- less propaganda

The future of *Focus/Focus on CDS*

1. Introduction

The [Focus/Focus on CDS readers' survey](#) ran from 27/03/08 until 30/04/08. It was available to complete online and a paper copy was sent to 22,318 people on the master *Focus/Focus on CDS* mailing list (dated January 2007).

The online version was open to the public, but required registration to complete it.

The paper copy of the survey urged people to complete it online, and to pass the link around to others to complete.

1.1 Publicity

The online survey was publicised in the LSC Update on the following dates:

- 27/03/08 – feature story
- 10/04/08
- 24/04/08

The [Focus pages](#) on the LSC website also contained a link to the survey.

1.2 Response rate and method

A total of 389 people responded to the survey:

- responded **online** – **72 (18.5%)**
- responded **by post** – **317 (81.5%)**

As a rough guide to reader preference for paper or electronic, paper seems to be the overwhelming winner. However, several factors may account for this:

- an unquantifiable number of people may have responded both online and by post
- 23,000 people received a paper copy of the survey, far fewer receive the LSC Update (around 7,830) prompting them to go online to respond
- the blurb at the top of the paper survey urging people to complete it online may well not have been read (indeed, the answers some people gave to questions suggested they hadn't read the blurb, ie saying 'get rid of the print copy as it costs too much' - which was the first line of the blurb!)
- it's easy to fill out a paper survey that lands straight on your desk – going online may require more effort (possibly even going to another room to get on a PC), as well as the requirement to register, which may have pushed some people back to the paper version
- the paper version offered anonymity, the online version requires registration (although this can be anonymous to an extent).

1.3 Comparison with 2006 survey

The most recent previous *Focus* reader survey was conducted in December 2006. A survey card of three questions and an open comments box was sent out in the December issue of *Focus* (#52).

The survey received 197 responses – just over half the number received in total in 2008.

The three questions are not similar enough to questions asked in the 2008 survey to make any meaningful comparisons of responses.

2. Results – analysis

2.1 Content

2.1.1 Useful content

This table shows the response given to question 2, “How useful do you find these sections of *Focus/Focus on CDS*?”

	News	Comment	Case studies	Legal
Very useful	178	88	96	164
Quite useful	175	218	191	173
Not useful at all	17	45	46	16
Don't read	5	11	26	9
Don't know	5	5	7	6
No answer given	9	22	23	21

Content ranked **in order of usefulness**:

- **News** – 353 respondents said quite or very useful (or 331, subtracting number who rated it not useful at all or who don't read it)
- **Legal** – 337 respondents said quite or very useful (312, as above)
- **Comment** – 306 respondents said quite or very useful (250, as above)
- **Case studies** – 287 respondents said quite or very useful (215, as above)

Content ranked in order of **not useful at all or not read**:

- **Case studies** – 72 respondents said they don't read it or don't find it useful
- **Comment** – 56 respondents said they don't read it or don't find it useful
- **Legal** – 25 respondents said they don't read it or don't find it useful
- **News** – 22 respondents said they don't read it or don't find it useful

2.1.2 Why people read *Focus/Focus on CDS*

Reasons for reading *Focus/Focus on CDS*, ranked in order of most popular:

- News (30%/309 people)
- Legal reference (21%/211)
- To fulfil contract obligations¹ (18%/183)
- Case studies (14%/137)
- Analysis and comment (12%/124)
- Other (4%/43)
- Don't read it (1%/7)

Results given under 'Other' included:

- answers that could be interpreted as 'news' (eg “to keep up to date” or “to get info on LSC changes”)
- for payment dates, funding/costs information, Keycards
- criticism of rate of legal aid reforms

All the answers given as 'other' are available in Appendix 5.

¹ It isn't clear what is understood by 'to fulfil contract obligations'. At the time of writing the survey, it was believed that the LSC was contractually obliged to provide *Focus* and that providers were obliged to receive it as the main source of communication and updates. It has since been confirmed that there is no contractual obligation relating to *Focus*. The motives behind those selecting this response are therefore open to speculation and interpretation, making it hard to draw conclusions.

See Appendix 1 for a cross-tabulation of how useful respondents find each section against why they read *Focus/Focus on CDS*.

2.1.3 Improving the magazine

The table below shows the options for improving the magazine, in order of preference:

Rank	Option	Results
1	Divide content into sections relating to areas of work	17% (217)
2	Comment pieces from legal aid providers/related bodies	12% (155)
3	Forthcoming events guide	9% (117)
4	Regional sections	9% (115)
5	More frequent	9% (113)
6	Consultations page	7% (94)
7	Add a letters page	6% (80)
8	More news	6% (73)
9	More case studies	5% (70)
10	More comment ²	3% (44)
11	Shorter news items	2% (31)
12	Votes and polls	2% (26)
13	Longer news features	2% (22)
14	Less comment	1% (16)
15	Fewer case studies	1% (14)
16	Add relevant advertising	1% (9)
	Other	7% (86) ³
	TOTALS	99% (1,282)

Other comments included:

- Less propaganda
- Keycard should stay in it
- Definitely NO advertising/we don't mind advertising
- Requests for sections for specific areas of work/professions/interests

All the answers given as 'other' are available in Appendix 6.

2.1.4 In summary

- *Focus* and *Focus on CDS* are primarily seen as news and reference publications
- Comment pieces and case studies are considered less useful – although comment pieces from legal aid providers or related bodies would be welcomed
- Many respondents would like to see some changes to the structure of the magazine, making it more targeted (eg dividing content up into areas of work or adding regional sections)
- Many respondents would also welcome some additions to the content (eg adding a forthcoming events guide)
- 115 people would like the magazine to be more frequent.

² Seen with hindsight, this option doesn't make clear a distinction between more comment from the LSC (which is what was intended) and more comment from any source (which is how it may have been interpreted – although 'comment pieces from legal aid providers/related bodies' is a separate option).

³ 43 of these 86 can be discounted, leaving 43 actual responses. The 'other' box was ticked in 43 cases when paper surveys were keyed in (by the *Focus* editor) if no other options had been selected, as the question was mandatory online.

2.2 Two magazines?

2.2.1 Who reads what

Of the 389 respondents to the survey:

- 259 (67%) receive *Focus*
- 25 (6%) receive *Focus on CDS*
- 102 (26%) receive both magazines
- 3 (1%) didn't know which magazine they received⁴

The *Focus* and *Focus on CDS* mailing lists⁵ (amended in January 2007, but still with hundreds of inaccuracies) suggest that:

- **19,851** addresses only receive ***Focus***
- **2,496** addresses only receive ***Focus on CDS***
- **1,917** addresses receive **both** magazines

This suggests that:

- Total number receiving *Focus* = 21,768
- Total number receiving *Focus on CDS* = 4,413

However, the source of these figures is slightly unreliable, partly because there may be some undetected duplications in addresses across the two source lists. See footnote 5 for a full explanation.

Overall however, this clearly shows that the number of people receiving **only *Focus on CDS*** is **not significant** (10%).

2.2.2 Who wants what

58% of respondents would like to see *Focus on CDS* kept as a separate publication.

Of the remaining 42% (157 people):

- 49 respondents said the two magazines should merge, but with a distinct *Focus on CDS* section
- 8 people said they should just be one publication
- 100 people don't mind what happens

Appendix 2 shows a cross tabulation of which magazines respondents said they receive against whether respondents would like the two magazines to stay separate. The trend is:

- Most people, regardless of which magazine they receive, would prefer to see the two magazines remaining separate.

However...

- Those who feel most strongly about it are the small group who only receive *Focus on CDS* – around 99% would like the two to stay separate
- Those who receive both magazines are weighted in favour of separate publications, but with a very small show of support for the merge/don't mind options
- Those who only receive *Focus* show the most support for merging options/don't mind.

⁴ Of these 3, one person actively ticked 'don't know' when filling in online. The other two were left blank on paper copies – when keyed into the online survey 'don't know' was the only relevant option to pick, as the question was mandatory to answer in the online survey.

⁵ These figures are taken from two lists. A 'master' list was created in January 2007 bringing together several previous lists, and cleansing some of the data - but there are still hundreds of inaccuracies. A separate *Focus on CDS* list still hovers in the background. It is unclear what the crossover is between the two lists, although for mailing purposes the list named '*Focus & CDS* mailing master – Jan 07' is taken to be most accurate.

2.2.3 In summary

The number of people who only receive *Focus on CDS* is very small (around 10% of the distribution list).

Most people would prefer the two publications to remain separate.

2.2.4 Recommendations

Producing two magazines would satisfy most respondents but would be very labour intensive, and would probably have an impact on the frequency of production [see 2.3.2].

The most sensible recommendation is to **produce one single magazine**, but with a **distinct section for *Focus on CDS***. This would match respondents' preferences for more targeted content [see 2.1.5], and would allow more frequent production of the magazine.

2.3 Frequency

There is a very even split in responses to the question 'How frequently should *Focus* be published?'

Option	Result
Quarterly	30% (114)
Every other month	32% (123)
Monthly	33% (127)
Other	5% (20)
No response	1% (5)

Of those who responded with 'Other' the comments supported producing the magazine when there is something important to communicate (although many of these backed a regular schedule with the capacity to produce additional copies as necessary).

This table shows responses given in the 'Other' box, and then adds them to the results above:

Frequency	Number responding in 'Other'	Total
Quarterly	4	118 (30%)
Every other month	5	128 (33%)
Monthly	1	128 (33%)
Fortnightly	1	1 (0.2%)
Bi-annually	1	1 (0.2%)
Never	3	3 (0.8%)
As and when changes occur/as often as necessary	7	7 (1.8%)
No response	0	5 (1.3%)

A full breakdown of comments given under 'Other' is available in Appendix 7.

2.3.1 In summary

A more frequent publication (monthly/every other month) is more popular than remaining quarterly:

- **30%** for maintaining a quarterly schedule
- **66%** for moving to a more frequent schedule (monthly or every other month).
- In addition, 113 people (29%) indicated in Q4 that making *Focus/Focus* in CDS more frequent would improve the publications – the 5th most popular option.

A very small number of people indicated other options for frequency, but not enough to influence the decision.

2.4 Using the magazine

2.4.1 How much people read

The majority of respondents (68%) only read the bits of the magazine that are relevant to their work. Just under one-third (29%) of respondents said they read the whole issue, and 2% said they don't read it at all.

See Appendix 3 for a cross-tabulation of how much of the magazine is read against profession (eg how many solicitors read only the bits relevant to their work).

2.4.2 Passing the magazine on

Three-quarters of respondents always (49%) or sometimes (26%) pass the magazine on to others to read. One-quarter said they don't pass it on (although this may be because they are a sole practitioner).

This could indicate that readership numbers are greater than the c. 23,000 names on the distribution list (bearing in mind that many of the 23,000 copies are returned unopened and we don't know how many others are binned unopened).

2.4.3 Referring to back issues

72% of respondents refer to back issues. Of these the majority refer back sometimes (244 people) and only a few (34 people) refer back all the time.

18% said they hardly ever refer back, and 10% said they never refer back.

3 people said they didn't know if they refer back to previous issues.

2.4.4 In summary

Most people (68%) only read the bits of the magazine that is relevant to their work.

The magazine is clearly viewed as useful, whether read in full or in part:

- 75% of respondents sometimes or always pass the magazine on to others to read
- 72% of respondents refer to back issues

2.5 Moving online

The survey asked several questions to gauge how ready *Focus/Focus on CDS* readers are for an online magazine, and how they think they might use it. Those completing the survey online could also test two versions of an online *Focus*:

- a straight PDF
- an e-zine⁶

2.5.1 Paper or screen?

This table shows how respondents think that they will read *Focus/Focus on CDS* when they are only available online:

Option	Results
Read on screen and print out	43% (167)
Read on screen only	22% (84)
Print out only	19% (75)
Don't know yet	16% (63)

Most people will probably still print some or all of the magazine, as well as reading it on screen. Those who say they will only read it on screen slightly outnumber those who anticipate that they will print it out to read rather than viewing it on screen.

2.5.2 Computer confidence

This table shows what kind of technology respondents use:

Option	Results
Windows desktop	62% (341)
Windows laptop	27% (150)
Macintosh system	2% (9)
Hand held device (eg Blackberry, PDA, iPhone)	7% (38)
Don't know	0% (0)
Other	2% (12)

Most people use a PC or laptop, but a small number also use hand held devices.

Answers to 'other' included:

- none/pen and paper/my brain/my secretary
- mobile phones

Question 12 asked respondents to rate their confidence using technology. This table shows the results:

	Email	The Internet	Computers in general
Very	246	234	180
Quite	113	125	173
Not at all	20	20	26
Don't know	10	10	10

This indicates that most respondents – whether they replied online (72) or by paper (317) feel at least quite happy using email, the Internet and computers in general.

Appendix 4 shows a cross-tabulation of the method used to respond (paper or online) against confidence using technology. Overall, the cross-tabulated results match the same

⁶ The e-zine was a working version of *Focus* created using Flash Player by Ceros Media (one of several companies that produce digital editions of magazines from a PDF original).

trend as the table above – so most of those who responded by paper consider themselves to be at least quite confident using email, the Intranet and computers in general.

2.5.3 Testing the examples

Of the two online examples, the PDF version received slightly more favourable responses, especially in terms of on-screen readability and ease of use. However, 26 respondents (42%) agreed that the e-zine had some useful features. This table shows the responses for both the PDF and the e-zine examples:

		Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
I was able to view the magazine on my computer without technical problems	PDF	37	27	1	1	1	67
	e-zine	26	28	4	7	4	69
I found the [PDF/e-zine] format easy to use	PDF	30	30	4	1	1	66
	e-zine	22	18	10	15	3	68
I found it easy to read on screen	PDF	30	28	6	2	1	67
	e-zine	9	22	13	17	6	67
I think this format is an acceptable alternative to the print version	PDF	25	28	8	4	1	66
	e-zine	17	28	15	5	3	68
If the [PDF/e-zine] format is used for <i>Focus</i> , I might print out all or some of the magazine to read	PDF	18	35	7	4	2	66
	e-zine	14	32	12	5	3	66
This [PDF/e-zine] can be filed and searched electronically. This is how I will store and use it.	PDF	17	26	16	5	2	66
	e-zine	15	20	22	9	2	68
If you have a disability that affects your use of computers, would you agree that this format is accessible?	PDF	1	6	23	1	1	32
	e-zine	0	5	24	2	2	33
I think the e-zine has some useful features	e-zine only	17	26	11	7	1	62

A small number of respondents made general comments about the two versions. They can be read in full in Appendix 8. One respondent suggested that the e-zine would confuse most solicitors – especially as they are used to using PDFs. By contrast, another respondent preferred the e-zine format to the PDF.

2.5.4 In summary

- a large number of respondents (242) will probably still print out some or part of the magazine

- a large number of respondents (251) will read it on screen either before they print, or instead of printing
- a smaller number of respondents (75) will only use the magazine as a print out
- 63 respondents are not sure yet how they will use the online magazine
- neither the PDF nor the e-zine was disliked, but the PDF was considered marginally easier to use.

2.6 Other comments

There was space in the survey for respondents to leave other comments. 43 people responded – their comments can be read in full in Appendix 9. Several people made the same sort of comments, which were:

- don't make it online
- *Focus* is a waste of money
- send email alerts when a new one is published
- less propaganda

Appendix 1

Cross- tabulation of “How useful do you find these sections of *Focus/Focus on CDS*” against “Why do you read *Focus/Focus on CDS*?”

	News					Total
	Very useful	Quite useful	Not useful at all	Don't read	Don't know	
For news	169 (16.7%)	135 (13.4%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (0.4%)	309 (30.6%)
For analysis and comment pieces	71 (7.0%)	50 (5.0%)	2 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.1%)	124 (12.3%)
For case studies	71 (7.0%)	60 (5.9%)	5 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	136 (13.5%)
For legal reference	107 (10.6%)	89 (8.8%)	8 (0.8%)	1 (0.1%)	2 (0.2%)	207 (20.5%)
To fulfil contract obligations	92 (9.1%)	82 (8.1%)	6 (0.6%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (0.3%)	183 (18.1%)
I don't read it	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (0.3%)	4 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)	7 (0.7%)
Other (please specify)	24 (2.4%)	13 (1.3%)	4 (0.4%)	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)	43 (4.3%)
No answer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Total	534 (52.9%)	429 (42.5%)	29 (2.9%)	6 (0.6%)	11 (1.1%)	1009 (100.0%)

	Comment					Total
	Very useful	Quite useful	Not useful at all	Don't read	Don't know	
For news	83 (8.4%)	179 (18.2%)	27 (2.7%)	6 (0.6%)	2 (0.2%)	297 (30.2%)
For analysis and comment pieces	46 (4.7%)	73 (7.4%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.1%)	121 (12.3%)
For case studies	46 (4.7%)	78 (7.9%)	9 (0.9%)	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)	135 (13.7%)
For legal reference	54 (5.5%)	118 (12.0%)	20 (2.0%)	5 (0.5%)	5 (0.5%)	202 (20.5%)
To fulfil contract obligations	48 (4.9%)	106 (10.8%)	23 (2.3%)	2 (0.2%)	3 (0.3%)	182 (18.5%)
I don't read it	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (0.3%)	3 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (0.6%)
Other (please specify)	9 (0.9%)	22 (2.2%)	6 (0.6%)	1 (0.1%)	2 (0.2%)	40 (4.1%)
No answer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Total	286 (29.1%)	576 (58.6%)	89 (9.1%)	18 (1.8%)	14 (1.4%)	983 (100.0%)

	Case Studies					Total
	Very useful	Quite useful	Not useful at all	Don't read	Don't know	
For news	86 (8.8%)	157 (16.1%)	30 (3.1%)	19 (1.9%)	5 (0.5%)	297 (30.4%)
For analysis and comment pieces	38 (3.9%)	64 (6.6%)	8 (0.8%)	6 (0.6%)	2 (0.2%)	118 (12.1%)
For case studies	66 (6.8%)	68 (7.0%)	2 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.1%)	137 (14.0%)
For legal reference	65 (6.7%)	109 (11.2%)	15 (1.5%)	7 (0.7%)	5 (0.5%)	201 (20.6%)
To fulfil contract obligations	49 (5.0%)	91 (9.3%)	26 (2.7%)	8 (0.8%)	5 (0.5%)	179 (18.3%)
I don't read it	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (0.3%)	3 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (0.6%)
Other (please specify)	5 (0.5%)	22 (2.3%)	7 (0.7%)	4 (0.4%)	1 (0.1%)	39 (4.0%)
No answer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Total	309 (31.6%)	511 (52.3%)	91 (9.3%)	47 (4.8%)	19 (1.9%)	977 (100.0%)

	Legal					Total
	Very useful	Quite useful	Not useful at all	Don't read	Don't know	
For news	141 (14.4%)	139 (14.2%)	7 (0.7%)	6 (0.6%)	5 (0.5%)	298 (30.4%)
For analysis and comment pieces	64 (6.5%)	53 (5.4%)	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)	2 (0.2%)	121 (12.4%)
For case studies	77 (7.9%)	55 (5.6%)	3 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	135 (13.8%)
For legal reference	119 (12.2%)	77 (7.9%)	3 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (0.3%)	202 (20.6%)
To fulfil contract obligations	85 (8.7%)	81 (8.3%)	7 (0.7%)	2 (0.2%)	2 (0.2%)	177 (18.1%)
I don't read it	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (0.3%)	3 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (0.6%)
Other (please specify)	14 (1.4%)	21 (2.1%)	3 (0.3%)	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)	40 (4.1%)
No answer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Total	500 (51.1%)	426 (43.5%)	27 (2.8%)	13 (1.3%)	13 (1.3%)	979 (100.0%)

Appendix 2

Cross- tabulation of “Which magazine do you usually receive from the LSC?” against “Should we continue to produce a separate publication *Focusing* only on crime (*Focus on CDS*)?”

	Focus	Focus on CDS	Both	Don't know	Total
Yes - keep them separate	130 (32.7%)	24 (6.0%)	61 (15.4%)	3 (0.8%)	218 (54.9%)
No, make them one publication - but with a distinct CDS section	26 (6.5%)	1 (0.3%)	24 (6.0%)	0 (0.0%)	51 (12.8%)
No - make them one publication	6 (1.5%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	8 (2.0%)
I don't mind	89 (22.4%)	1 (0.3%)	10 (2.5%)	1 (0.3%)	101 (25.4%)
No answer	13 (3.3%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (1.5%)	0 (0.0%)	19 (4.8%)
Total	264 (66.5%)	26 (6.5%)	103 (25.9%)	4 (1.0%)	397 (100.0%)

Appendix 3

Cross-tabulation of “When you receive *Focus/Focus on CDS* do you...” against “I am responding to this consultation as...”

	Read the whole issue	Read the bits relevant to your work	I don't read it	Total
Individual Legal Aid Practitioner - solicitor, advisor or mediator (not on behalf of my organisation)	19 (4.8%)	57 (14.4%)	0 (0.0%)	76 (19.2%)
Solicitor, on behalf of my firm	58 (14.7%)	109 (27.6%)	2 (0.5%)	169 (42.8%)
Not-For-Profit Provider, on behalf of my organisation	8 (2.0%)	22 (5.6%)	0 (0.0%)	30 (7.6%)
Family Mediation Service (for profit or not-for-profit)	5 (1.3%)	16 (4.1%)	0 (0.0%)	21 (5.3%)
Non-Legal Aid Contracted Provider	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Individual Barrister	2 (0.5%)	21 (5.3%)	7 (1.8%)	30 (7.6%)
Barrister on behalf of Chambers	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)
National Provider	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Representative Body	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)
Regional or Local Provider	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)
Representative Body	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)
Client Representative Body	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)
Judge	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)
Other (please specify)	23 (5.8%)	42 (10.6%)	0 (0.0%)	65 (16.5%)
No answer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Total	115 (29.1%)	271 (68.6%)	9 (2.3%)	395 (100.0%)

Appendix 4

Cross-tabulation of “Did you respond online?” against “How confident are you using...”

		Yes	No	Total
Email	Very	64 (16.1%)	188 (47.4%)	252 (63.5%)
	Quite	15 (3.8%)	100 (25.2%)	115 (29.0%)
	Not at all	1 (0.3%)	19 (4.8%)	20 (5.0%)
	Don't know	0 (0.0%)	10 (2.5%)	10 (2.5%)
	No answer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
	Total	80 (20.2%)	317 (79.8%)	397 (100.0%)

		Yes	No	Total
The internet	Very	60 (15.1%)	179 (45.1%)	239 (60.2%)
	Quite	19 (4.8%)	109 (27.5%)	128 (32.2%)
	Not at all	1 (0.3%)	19 (4.8%)	20 (5.0%)
	Don't know	0 (0.0%)	10 (2.5%)	10 (2.5%)
	No answer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
	Total	80 (20.2%)	317 (79.8%)	397 (100.0%)

		Yes	No	Total
Computers in general	Very	48 (12.1%)	135 (34.0%)	183 (46.1%)
	Quite	31 (7.8%)	147 (37.0%)	178 (44.8%)
	Not at all	1 (0.3%)	25 (6.3%)	26 (6.5%)
	Don't know	0 (0.0%)	10 (2.5%)	10 (2.5%)
	No answer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
	Total	80 (20.2%)	317 (79.8%)	397 (100.0%)

Appendix 5

Why do read *Focus/Focus on CDS*?

This is a full list of responses given as 'Other':

- For updates to claims & coding procedures
- I loathe on-line publications such as this. They are not user friendly and difficult to simply browse through for items of relevance and interest. They might save the LSC money but are nothing like as effective a way of disseminating information as paper newsletters.
- To know of future plans and developments at the LSC
- Interested in costs issues
- NO LONGER REQUIRE *FOCUS ON CDS* AS NO LONGER DO CRIME
- to get info on Lsc changes
- To keep up to date
- to know about funding and rate changes
- Keycard
- Occasionally read case studies - 1 [I?][illegible] 5
- Updates re legal aid
- To try to understand the LSC position even if I don't agree with it!
- For payment dates. I am a barrister and it's aimed at solicitors.
- For legal aid payment dates
- Payment dates
- In case I miss something I need to know
- To keep up to date with constant changes
- changes in [illegible]
- Also to see if there may be anything of interest to the firm's fee earners
- None
- Up to date costs information
- To clarify changing rates etc
- For legal aid eligibility check list/card legal aid update
- It tells the policy of the LSC
- in particular billing requirements
- 'Hidden' charges [changes?] not [illegible] notified.
- updates in legal aid franchise
- More guidance on forthcoming changes
- Desperately seeking clarification and instructions!
- info on contracts - keycards etc
- For information on changes to payment rates/regulations/procedure etc
- Adjudicator
- Updates and charges
- To keep up with all the LSC constant changes
- Costs drafting issues/developments
- Information only disseminated this way
- To find out about changes to means criteria for funding
- To understand funding issues
- To keep abreast of (far too frequent) contract changes & for post change reference (but I do not consider this to be 'legal reference')
- Updates on legal aid issues
- Updating knowledge for lectures and my books, Darbyshire on the ELS
- To monitor the many changes

Appendix 6

What can we do to improve the magazine?

These are the answers given as 'Other':

- Add references to information on the website for remuneration rates etc.
- Do away with the online versions
- More details on funding and remuneration
- *Focus* should concentrate on providing information and guidance. Comment should appear in a separate LSC publication - some of the recent comment has a bias that many practitioners disagree with. Neither do I see much point in "case studies" which do not appear to illustrate a useful point other than to demonstrate that someone has been assisted through legal aid. Articles in old *Focus* publications are very useful and there should be a facility to search for information against back copies, or there should be an up to date index. Organisations will want to save whole editions, and cut and paste elements to include in other documents, or email to a group of staff. For this reason the publication should contain minimal graphics, no pictures and be stripped down generally.
- If delivered electronically - Links to relevant sections on LSC website would be very useful. 2) Education section for trainee solicitors working in legally funded work would be useful for level of language/understanding would assist understanding and motivational encouragement to stay in legally aided work.
- data base section to search for relevant information required
- highlight lsc changes on front page
- More articles relevant to mediation providers especially the not for profit sector
- A specific regular up to date section on family mediation, dealing with important issues.
- I do not read it
- Nothing
- If in electronic format always include a link to the most up to date keycard
- News about changes to be given in advance
- On paper not on web [illegible text] previous copies
- Less propaganda from LSC!
- Consultations assume you are going to take note of the consultation
- Generally considered to be a propaganda document and very unrealistic. Balanced view?
- I am disappointed that the LSC is always presenting its political face eg its comments on losing in C.A. on Unified Contract
- More family case studies.
- Stop publishing it
- Not really relevant to us
- [Next to 'consultations page' box on paper survey] Don't make me laugh
- Save money by not printing it
- Tell us what is happening about LSC computerisation
- Definitely no advertising
- We don't mind if you start accepting advertisements
- As brief and to the point as possible
- Less propaganda from LSC
- Please forward *Focus* to us
- Most is irrelevant to us, other than keycard
- Make entirely online and have more *Focused* search engine
- All that is needed is summary of relevant information - too busy and [illegible] all [illegible] extra stuff
- NO COMMENT

- Clearer info re new legal aid news
- Notify to prescribed accounts with concise info on (above) changes
- Information from other court users
- No, it is fine as it is
- Clarify legal and profession structure and linkages ie SRA, Law Society, Lexcel [?], LSC, Quality Marks etc. Also Question and Answers section
- At present it reads like a propaganda publication - it needs a dissenting article or two!
- NO advertising
- NO
- An update section on where LSC listened and changes were actually made. Mediation section.
- Letters - only if answered.
- Advertising - NO definitely not

Appendix 7

How frequently should *Focus/Focus on CDS* be published?

These are the responses given as 'Other':

- In paper form
- FORTNIGHTLY
- Every other month but supported by *Focus* update emails if there are any changes that need to be brought to subscribers attention between publication dates.
- I think quarterly is too infrequent during this time of rapid change, and would welcome monthly or every other month
- Bi-annually
- Quarterly is a good middle ground but more or less frequent would be fine if there is news to share - I think it is more important to be up to date
- I don't read it
- as is now
- NEVER
- Never
- Never
- As often as necessary
- Quarterly - but more frequently when changes occurring
- Quarterly - with facility to produce extra issues should the need arise
- When it's necessary to notify a change
- Every other month, but when there are so many changes more often
- Depends on how much change there is but at best every other month
- Every other month - or when relevant changes occur
- As and when something important needs reporting
- Depends how much material you have

Appendix 8

Testing the online examples

These are the comments made under 'Other':

E-zine version:

- The majority of my fee earners will find the navigation unfamiliar and unnecessarily complicated, thus immediately making them dislike it and probably ignore it. I found it very difficult to find a comfortable "zoom" for reading "inside" pages (eg 2 & 3) as the default makes the text too small and Zoom makes it far far too big. There is no gradual zoom that I could find. On the positive side, the clippings function is quite clever, but I'm not sure that I would actually use it that much. I much prefer the PDF version.
- I prefer this format to the PDF format that is currently being used
- I found this version unnecessarily awkward. Please see my comments above about producing a stripped down version of *Focus*.
- Saves paper, postage-good for the environment

PDF version:

- Fee earners are used to accessing PDF files and will find the navigation more intuitive. Reader v8 provides simpler "copy" functions than the clipping function in the full e-version, but this apparent loss is outweighed by speed and familiarity.
- I much prefer the e-zine version to this pdf version
- I found this version unnecessarily awkward. Please see my comments above about producing a stripped down version of *Focus*.
- Saves cost, postage, paper-good for environment
- Prefer the e-zine format

Appendix 9

Other comments

These are the all the comments made under 'Other Comments' (question 13):

- Don't make it online only. Don't change the layout.
- The pdf version of *Focus* and *Focus on CDS* has been very useful as since taking up this position I have been able to save a copy and then send it as an email attachment to relevant staff. We also have an intranet that I manage and I have been able to include the most recent edition within the docustore section for general consumption by all staff.
- This is a very useful publication to build links between the LSC and suppliers, and keep suppliers updated of developments and future plans
- Can *Focus* can be emailed out in future rather than just being published on the LSC site?
- An email alert that a new issue is available but would be very useful
- I am sorry to be so negative. However I used to force myself to read it and (i) objectively it was not if use to me and (ii) I did not find it interesting. I keep back copies on a shelf for 18 months or so in case I should at some future time be informed of something of relevance to me in it.
- Presentation needs to be better.
- None
- More frequent publication than current quarterly frequency especially in view of updates affecting public funding and contractual obligations.
- Less likely to read it when electronic. I hate having to read things online and am not prepared to print it.
- The magazine should continue to be published, more likely to read it - online will not have time and not want to print off - in hard copy and take to court or home to read.
- I am afraid I find the magazine of no use and regard it as a waste of money that would be better spent on providing legal services to the disadvantaged. Sorry!
- I question the money spent on *Focus*. A bulletin, rather than magazine, is all that's required in my view.
- It's a waste of taxpayers' money - stop publishing it
- I think the loss of the paper magazine is huge and a big mistake - if it expensive to produce then put adverts in as per Gazette!
- Not really relevant - have ceased publicly funded work
- [Re Q12 in paper copy - confidence using technology] I know a very skilled secretary!
- Online it's like a pyramid - you get side-tracked and forget what you were looking for in the first place
- Prefer *Focus* to emails - quicker to assimilate news. Emails too time consuming.
- There are too many changes occurring for *Focus* to be anything less than monthly.
- Need it in summary form. Not like the LSC website which is far too detailed.
- I am a technophobe!
- Less "puff" items saying how positive the changes are
- Send *Focus* in good time prior to changes
- Please continue *Focus* in PRINT i.e. its present format with added features. Lots of people will never bother to read it electronically.
- [written next to Q6 in paper copy - Do you pass *Focus* on to others to read - answer ticked was 'No'] Because comes via email